

REMARKS

This Amendment, filed in reply to the Office Action dated February 19, 2008, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of objection and rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is rejected. Claims 2 and 3 are objected to. Claim 1 is canceled herewith without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 2 and 3 are rewritten into an independent form, support for which can be found throughout the specification, and at least in Claim 1 as originally filed. Now new matter is added by way of this amendment. Also, it is believed that no new consideration is required because the Office indicates that Claims 2 and 3 are free of prior art. Entry and consideration of this amendment are respectfully requested.

Objections to the Specification

On page 3 of the Office Action, the abstract of the disclosure is objected to as being insufficiently descriptive of the claimed invention. In the objection, it is asserted that the abstract should specify a method for treatment of severe aphasia as a result of cerebrovascular accident in patients suffering from said aphasia for at least three years.

Applicants respectfully submit that the abstract attached herewith is sufficiently descriptive of the claimed invention, thus overcoming the objection.

Withdrawal of the objection is therefore respectfully requested.

The Rejection of Claim 1 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), is Moot

On page 3 of the Office Action, Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Huber, W., of record (*Pharmacopsychiatry*, 1999). In making the rejection,

the Examiner alleges that Huber discloses the administration of 2-oxo-1-pyrrolidineacetamide (i.e., piracetam) in the treatment of acute and chronic aphasia following stroke, and that administration of such a compound to a patient would inherently encompass an acceptable carrier to deliver the compound to a patient, which may be as simple as water.

Solely to advance prosecution, and without acquiescing in the rejection, Applicants herewith cancel Claim 1 without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering the rejection moot.

Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

The Objection to Claims 2 and 3 is Moot

In the Office Action, claims 2 and 3 are objected to because they refer to rejected claim 1, while being appeared to be free of the art.

Claims 2 and 3 are rewritten into an independent form, rendering the objection moot.

Withdrawal of the objection is therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sunhee Lee/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Sunhee Lee
Registration No. 53,892

Date: May 19, 2008